Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*

Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066

VOL. VII, NO. 1, *Issue Number* 310, JANUARY 4, 1950 ★ *Editors:* FELIX MORLEY & FRANK C. HANIGHEN

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA JAN 10 1950 LIBRARY

OUR POLITICAL DEVALUATION

by Lewis O. Anderson

The prevalent confusion as to the respective roles of politics and onomics makes the American people easy victims of the very totalitarns we profess to fight.

We are stupidly endeavoring to stop the advance of Communism by non-political "economics". Simultaneously we ignore an insidious political devaluation, which of itself goes far to explain why we are losing the "cold" war.

By "political devaluation" I mean decline of respect for political principles and "rule of law" in official government, and the awkward attempts to solve governmental problems solely on a materialistic basis. The decline of respect for "rule of law" extends down through private forms of self-regulation in the economic sphere. The function of politics in our system is to provide general principles favorable for ethical self-regulation in private economics.

Examples of political devaluation are the popularity of such terms as "economic democracy" and "economic liberty". As used today they do not mean self-regulation by "rule of law"; they accept, often unintentionally, the basic theory of Communism, namely, that materialistic economic forces determine political and moral ideals rather than vice versa. And with our political deterioration goes moral deterioration all down the line, in this attempt to construct a dehumanized "economics". Principles of human behavior are disregarded or grossly misrepresented in this shift of emphasis from truly liberal politics to Marxist economics.

Communists are not so naive. It is no secret that on their side of the ideological front they invariably combine "revolutionary theory" with "economics", to insure that their victims will draw the "right" political conclusion -- Socialism. We are attempting to block Communist aggression primarily with non-political "economic recovery" programs in foreign lands and with "economic development of backward areas". Deficit spending is further relied upon to scare Communists away from our back porch by floor-boards of "economic security".

The political devaluation in this country means that we are waging our struggle with Communism in reverse. The surrender came first. Hav-

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

1475452

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing surrendered the very political principles for which we claim to fight, we are now making a stand for something that neither major party will even formulate as a political issue. Empty slogans of "freedom" and "democracy" do not define any issue. They are no match for the "revolutionary theory" of the Communists.

A "hot" war would not defeat this theory. The "cold" war could do so -- if it were waged on the basis of political principles. Winning this war would mean for us winning converts to the political principles at stake. But you cannot win converts to a cause you have surrendered.

II

Of what worth would victory in a "shooting" war be, after surrender of political principles? World War I did not "make the world safe for democracy". It did put the U.S.S.R. on the map. World War II did not establish "four freedoms". It did put the Marxist class struggle into high gear in every corner of the globe. Because of our prior political abdication we were unprepared for post-war ideological leadership in both instances. We had disqualified ourselves. Having done so, what reason is there to think that we could gain anything other than final ideological defeat from a third world war?

We have our alibi for widespread abdication from our inherited unique position as torchbearers of political liberalism. We say that the principle of limited government is outmoded in our industrial age and must be abandoned or drastically modified. This alibi is a natural outgrowth of the delusion that in our industrial society we can get rid of individual responsibility without losing anything of real value. Obviously many Americans no longer consider liberty as a quality of real value, in comparison with something called security.

In the name of efficiency and apparent economic security, we have gradually been turning too many of our individual responsibilities over to giant corporations. The present trend towards government centralization and government monopoly is a natural outgrowth of the same delusion that in our industrial society we can get rid of our individual responsibility without losing anything of much value.

Political liberalism in an industrial age works only when there is exchange of responsibilities, not when the emphasis is on the elimination of responsibilities.

Our political devaluation is revealed in this decline of individual responsibility, both in private economic affairs and official government affairs. Hence the folly of proposing government monopoly as a cure for private monopoly. And hence also the folly of proposing that official government guarantee a "floor under economic security".

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Declaration of Independence was not a petition to the British king to grant the American people "economic security". It was, on the contrary, an indictment of the government of George III for usurping control of the people's economic life -- for doing precisely what President Truman is doing today.

The Declaration of Independence was a declaration of intention to build a new political foundation. And the mainspring of the resulting constitution was self-regulation among the people in economic life, , in all matters not specifically delegated to the central government. This political foundation is now largely destroyed, and "Economic Czars" now parade as the supreme authority.

Instead of expounding the true function of politics, our politicians generally prattle about so-called economics, which is not even economics but a Marxian fairy tale. It is a two-fold misrepresentation: misrepresentation of the true function of politics and misrepresentation of the true function of "profit" in our economic system. "Economic justice", whatever that may be, has even arisen to qualify justice as a pure and therefore reliable standard.

The confusion of tongues in this modern Babel of "economics" needs no reminder. What needs both comment and study is the fanatic simplicity of the fixed idea of those who "guide the revolution". That idea is "economic determinism". It is a pretentious denial of all moral values, including political values. To make "economic determinism" more attractive, it is dressed up as "social science". But why bother to misrepresent economics as such a "science", since it will in any case fill the void left by devaluing politics?

The confusion of tongues is greatest where it is most unbecoming, namely, among the ignorant anti-Communists. Mostly they are trying to fight Communism with variations on the theme of "economic determinism", which is about all they have to play with after having devalued politics. Ask a hundred vociferous anti-Communists the meaning of "economic determinism", and how it has infiltrated into every-day life, and see how many know. Indeed, how can they know when there is hardly anyone to tell them with language outside the Marxist lexicon?

So our leaders in the cold war echo variations on the theme of "economic determinism" suggested by their very enemy. Accordingly the clamor grows for minimum wages, pension schemes and other admittedly share-the-wealth schemes, minimum support prices for farm products,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

etc., on the theory that government price supports and the inevitable rubber dollars are a bulwark against Communism. People assert that "the Welfare State is the best insurance against Communism". It is like saying that sinning is the best way to avoid sin.

IV

Labor unions and other free organizations used to show a healthy respect for American ideals by trying self-regulation, instead of dragging every petty squabble into the arena of national politics. Today Labor unions, farm organizations, and even educational organizations are prone to use the power of national government to get what they want. This is merely an acceptance of Marx's definition of government as an instrument of exploitation by the ruling class. Why fight Communism if we are going Marxist in any case?

The devaluation of our traditional political belief makes inevitable the class struggle between myopic economic interests. Do the Marxists propose to change the definition of government as an instrument of exploitation? Absolutely not. They propose to reverse the present relationship of top dog and underdog. So do the modern deluded anti-Communists who toy with the same theory of government. They speak of "labor government" and "people's government", meaning a special class seeking to put an alleged ruling class into the dog-house. And they say "use the power of government", which is simply polite "social science" language for brute force.

While many anti-Communists bask in euphemistic ambiguities, the true Communists continue to perpetrate, by remote control, a glaring contradiction: on the one hand, subordinating politics to economics; on the other hand, continuously enlarging the power of central government.

This self-contradictory feat is performed as follows: First, by subordinating politics to economics the victims are led to believe they are not losing anything by surrendering political liberty. Second, centralized government is glorified by defining it as the "people's government". And so we approach the final anomaly, foreseen by Plato, the dictator who boasts of having a "mandate from the people".

Lewis O. Anderson, of Osakis, Minnesota, is a former professor of psychology who dislikes "gang life and crowd-mindedness".

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 1

By Frank C. Hanighen January 4, 1950

HOOVER: The bi-partisan foreign policy received its most damaging blow (so far) when the former President of the U. S. called for American protection of Formosa. Hoover not only descended directly into the political arena and took his most definite step in opposition to a Democratic Administration since 1941 (when he fought the Roosevelt foreign policy). He also took sides openly with the "anti-bipartisanism" forces in his own party. The former President's stand was similar to that taken last Thursday by Senator Taft, whose opposition to Republican bipartisanism is well known. The Hoover statement also came after Senator Wherry, minority leader in the White House, had denounced the bipartisan policy, and after Senator Vandenberg had reiterated his support of it. All this occurred at a time when the Administration's cynical exploitation of the policy has become glaringly obvious, and when defenders of the policy are decidedly on the defensive. The words of Hoover cannot help but be felt throughout the GOP; and indeed are not without effect on many Democrats as well.

The release of Hoover's opinion embodied in a letter to Senator Knowland, coincided with embarrassed gyrations of the Administration on the issue of defending Formosa. State Department attempts, by various methods, to give the impression that the Administration was "doing something" stood revealed as efforts to placate mounting Congressional sentiment against the whole debacle of our policy on China.

Hoover's act has provoked much speculation in another direction. Has his stand posed a possible break with President Truman? The Chief Executive has been evidently desirous of maintaining friendly relations with the former President, not the least because of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Government. Truman finds the Commission's report useful at times and presumably is loathe to break with Hoover. It is also noticeable that Hoover comes into conflict with Secretary of State Dean Acheson, who was Vice-Chairman of the Hoover Reorganization Commission and was active in writing its report.

Whether or not we should defend Formosa is one question, and a thorny one. But regardless of the answer, bipartisanism is undermined by the Hoover-Taft demarche.

* * * * *

ON CAPITOL HILL: On the opening day of the new session of Congress, Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn agreed with Minority Leader Joe Martin that taxes and spending will be the most important issues confronting this election-year session. But Sam doesn't go along with Joe in the latter's desire to reduce taxes. The Speaker said that "we are not going to take bites at this tax structure", lest it be "disjointed". What is needed, he indicated, is an "adjustment" of rates rather than a general increase or decrease. "Lots of places," said Sam, "they could reduce taxes, but in others they could be "adjusted more equitably." The next day, the President came clean. He wants to increase taxes, but "moderately". Colleagues ironically ask if the Fair Dealers' talk of "adjusting" that oil depreciation write-off of 27½ per cent will get any support from Rayburn of Texas.

As a matter of fact, the apparent Administration support today for a cut in excises may tomorrow prove ephemeral. Some Fair Dealers are beginning to argue that only the business interests involved really clamor for elimination or reduction of what is really a sales tax. They claim that the average working man, or indeed the

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

average citizen of any class, isn't usually conscious he is paying any tax on a railway fare, a telegram or movie ticket. And, after all -- they ask -- who buys mink coats? And how many votes have the mink-coat customers?

The New York delegation brings gossip that Governor Dewey, now that he has removed himself from the presidential field, has made an informal alliance with General Eisenhower, who really hasn't removed himself. Dewey, so the talk goes, will give support to the President of Columbia. The year 1952 is a long way off, but already there are those among the Eisenhower cult who worry lest Senator Taft win by an outstanding margin in his fight for Senate re-election next fall. If Taft should triumph by 400,000 or more, then he'd be a serious threat to the General -- so they fear. They even say that the Democratic bosses in Ohio would not be averse to such a result; that's why they back the weak Democratic aspirant, State Auditor Ferguson.

Meanwhile, Senator Taft is merely interrupting, for a short time, his campaign for re-election. On his return to Capitol Hill this week, he said he will be in Washington until January 23; thereafter he will make many trips to Ohio.

* * * * *

SENATOR DOUGLAS: Senator Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, made a highly interesting plea to the annual meeting of the American Economic Association on December 29 in New York. He called for a $4½ billion cut in U.S. expenditures and deployed in some detail his ideas as to how such savings should be made. Douglas' economy program is not exactly that of Senator Harry Byrd, but his general objectives are identical. The Virginia Senator would hardly quarrel with Douglas' analysis: "Unless this [the cut] is done, we shall be operating at a big deficit and will be forced to borrow additional credits from the banks. Since all signs point to comparative full employment, the creation of this additional credit will tend to force prices up and strengthen inflationary pressures. This would eat into the real incomes of the aged who are living on annuities, stimulate speculation, and lead to increased labor strife." Douglas is commonly classified as a "liberal" and perhaps he is the only one so classified in the press who really is a liberal. We hear rumors that many of the Left-Wing, because of such utterances as the above, are wondering whether he really is their sort of "liberal". Actually, Douglas has inherited, in a very genuine sense, the mantle of former Senator Robert M. LaFollette Jr., who (it may be recalled) also insisted on a balanced budget.

Apropos of this American Economic Association meeting, it seems to us that the press did scant justice to it. Some attending members have returned to Washington saying that many interesting speeches and remarks went unreported, notably one by Professor J. A. Schumpeter of Harvard. During a week when editors complained bitterly of the lack of news, it seems that they missed a trick when they failed to send a few of their reporters to the meeting in New York.

* * * * *

STRATEGY OF STEEL: Last week -- on December 29th, to be exact -- President Benjamin Fairless of the U.S. Steel Corporation -- slipped unnoticed into Washington, visited a Senate committee room -- and left again, still unnoticed by the press. It has been relayed to us that Fairless in conversation departed somewhat from the U.S. Steel's previous explanation for the price rise of $4 a ton. At first, Big Steel emphasized the rise in labor and pension costs. At the secret meeting on the Hill, however, Fairless is said to have laid much of the $4 hike to the mounting cost of new plant. He was referring to the Venezuelan iron ore development. This reported statement of Fairless may well be symptomatic of new steel strategy. Shortly before Mr. Fairless went to Washington, the Carnegie-Illinois subsidiary of U.S. Steel announced plans to build a new plant in Eastern Pennsylvania, on the Delaware river north of Philadelphia. It may be recalled that this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

column forecast this move many months ago, mentioning steel's new source of ore in South America. For some time, building of steel plants on the Eastern tidewater area has seemed inevitable due to the decline of the Mesabi field; and the new ore sources indicated have been Labrador and South America. Perhaps Fairless had anticipated some plans of the indefatigable Senator O'Mahoney, for we learn that the latter has been contemplating a new line of attack on Steel, i.e. that Big Steel need not have raised its prices if it had properly "decentralized" its operations. And it may be that the Carnegie-Illinois announcement was designed in part to take the sting out of the expected O'Mahoney assault.

Some observers in Washington read more into the whole matter. The project for a New England steel plant has unaccountably been delayed. Several months ago, announcement of selection of New London as a site and completion of financing was expected almost weekly. Now there is speculation that Big Steel may be angling for a share in the New England project. Those inclined to this theory say that such a mill, located in Connecticut, could tap the New York market at least as well as one situated between Camden and Philadelphia. It would also benefit from the financing which Boston capital has reportedly marshalled behind the project. The odd technique of announcing the plans for the Delaware river plant is also fitted into this theory. By having the president of a subsidiary make the announcement, the parent company could later withdraw the Delaware project and substitute for it participation in the New England deal.

* * * * *

STALIN: The best obiter dicta which we have seen on the Stalin birthday celebration in Moscow appeared in the Socialist Call (December 16, 1949) written by the Anarchist journalist Max Nomad. "A few years before the war," observes Nomad, "La Cultura of Turin, an Italian Fascist periodical, got into trouble because it had printed a disparaging article about Julius Caesar. The luckless editor had forgotten that Mussolini resented, as directed against himself, all strictures on his glorious predecessor of two thousand years ago. In Soviet Russia, all the early Bolshevik history books criticizing Ivan the Terrible and Peter the Great were suppressed as soon as Stalin obtained unlimited power."

In another note, Nomad comments: "According to the authoritarian, Santayana, Stalin is the greatest man of our age, comparable only to Napoleon. That comparison did not do justice to the great Georgian. It never occurred to the great Corsican to have a 'Napoleon Constitution' written by a man whom he was to have shot as a traitor as soon as the ink had dried.... Diocletian, wisest of the despots of Imperial Rome's decline, to avoid revolts by the generals and governors of his immense Empire, increased the number of those high officials while at the same time reducing the territories under their administration and the military forces at their disposal. During World War I, Stalin, wiser than the despots of Imperial Russia, to prevent the emergence of a man on horseback who could displace him, not only multiplied enormously the number of generals but also shifted them from one front to another and from victorious glamor to obscurity. This was more practical in war time than shooting the most famous generals as 'Nazi spies', as he had done a few years before the war.

"In his Political History of the French Revolution, Francois Aulard explains France's readiness to accept the authority of young Bonaparte by the fact that, 'he was head and shoulders above his contemporaries, all the more so as the guillotine had eliminated his possible rivals, the thinking or acting elite of the generation of that time.' Seen from this angle, the Inheritor of the Russian Revolution towers over the Corsican, for he himself had accomplished all the preliminary work of disposing of his potential rivals. Ernest Renan predicted the fate of Trotsky and Stalin long before they were born: 'Woe to him who makes the revolution; happy he who inherits it.'"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

The Road Ahead: America's Creeping Revolution, by John T. Flynn. New York: The Devin-Adair Company. $2.50. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

Mr. Flynn's book is of interest as a work of prophetic journalism rather than of political theory. His central thesis -- that such innovations as economic planning, social insurance, deficit financing, and the nationalization of credit must lead step by step toward mass enslavement and the totalitarian state -- is scarcely a novel one. It has been cogently argued elsewhere by the Messrs. von Hayek and von Mises, by Professor Jewkes, and for that matter by Mr. Flynn himself. Mr. Flynn considers that the thesis has been proved empirically by the British experience; thus it follows that the perpetuation of American freedoms and institutions is inseparable from the preservation of a free capitalism. He avoids, however, the difficult question raised by Juenger and others, whether capitalism and socialism, so far from being antitheses, are not merely proximate stages of an historical evolution made inevitable by the technological organization of society. Mr. Flynn's concern is rather to determine the precise point reached in our progress along the road to serfdom, and also to persuade us that even now a retreat is possible.

Mr. Flynn tells us that the principal impulsion toward socialism comes from the powerful group of theorists and political careerists who have now organized themselves as the Americans for Democratic Action. He perceives in them the disciples and counterparts of the British Fabians. Like the Fabians they have gained control of the trade union movement and have transformed it from an instrument for collective bargaining and the material improvement of wage-workers into an apparatus of political power. Their purpose, like the Fabians', is to achieve the socialized state through a process of gradualism and by constitutional means. Mr. Flynn considers our American Fabians to be at the moment more dangerous to American freedoms and institutions than the Communists, who have now been fully exposed as a treasonous, conspiratorial and servile sect. Mr. Flynn accepts the rupture between the "Liberal Left" and the Communists as genuine and complete, and he seems to agree that the former collaboration between them was on both sides one of expediency. He acquits the Fabians of any conscious subservience to the interests of Soviet Russia; indeed their power for mischief lies very largely in their good intentions and in the aura of respectability with which they have surrounded themselves and their purposes.

But the American Fabians, says Mr. Flynn, will realize their purposes only to find themselves, like the present Labour Government of Britain, enmeshed in problems for which there are no solutions except dictatorship and the police state. The Communists, with their surer grasp of economic truths, understand this, if the American Fabians do not. Thus the Communists may be trusted to lend their new adversaries every assistance toward the completion of the Welfare State. The great question now is whether the American Fabians will operate politically through the creation of a third party, after the pattern of the British Labour Party, or whether they will seek to enlarge and consolidate their already considerable control over the machinery and policies of the Democratic Party. Mr. Flynn indicates that the latter course is the more probable, for already in the Northern industrial States they exercise the decisive voice in the choice of candidates, and in the preparation of platforms and legislative agenda. Thus they have made captives not only of the local machines but even of the National administration. The administration, indeed, has been obliged to involve itself in plans for extending this power over the recalcitrant Democrats of the South; for this, says Mr. Flynn, is the real purpose that underlies the President's demand that Congress authorize the use of the Federal power to enforce his program of civil rights.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

European Supplement *to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 1

By Marion Doenhoff HAMBURG -- December, 1949

GERMANY PSYCHOLOGY TODAY: It is not only the events of the past that separate Germany from the rest of the world. There is something else that makes post-war understanding mutually difficult.

Although we are all living in the same period of history, we nevertheless concentrate on different phases. Thus the German mind, as this new decade dawns, is occupied with the period from 1945 on, and often it seems as though our memories cannot reach further back. Other peoples, it seems, are thinking of Germany only in terms of the Hitler period -- from 1933 to 1945. That is why they cannot imagine that the Germans since 1945 are no longer the same; nor do Americans seem fully to realize what has happened in Germany since 1945.

When the Allied armies occupied Germany they found some eight million Displaced Persons. Since then these have been repatriated, or have found new homes in other lands, excepting for some 200,000 who do not wish to return to the Eastern countries. But shortly after the close of hostilities the Allies themselves displaced about fifteen million persons of German blood and made them permanently homeless.

The Atlantic Charter, in stating the fundamental principles of Anglo-American post-war policy, forbad territorial annexation without the consent of the affected population. But what actually happened, after 1945, was the annexation of 23 per cent of the total area of pre-Hitler Germany by Poland, including the small section of East Prussia incorporated into Soviet Russia. In addition, there has been the virtual annexation of the Saar territory by France and finally, some months before the establishment of the West German Federal Republic, the so-called "frontier corrections" whereby Belgium and Holland enriched themselves without consideration of German pleadings and protests.

The concentration camps were one of the eternal stigmas on Nazi Germany, not only because of their barbaric methods and thousand-fold murders, but also because they were prisons in which men were for years robbed of their freedom without any kind of judicial process. Yet it is equally true that today, almost five years after the war, many thousands of Germans in the earlier occupied countries are still imprisoned without judgment and even without legal proceedings. This certainly does not convey to us the impression that Justice is always on the side of "the others".

General von Falkenhausen, the wartime military commander in Belgium, was never a Nazi and was everywhere respected as outstanding among all German generals. He worked ceaselessly to prevent outrages in Belgium, until in 1944 Hitler placed him in a concentration camp. Yet this man of 71 has now been shipped around through 51 prisons and camps in six different countries. For the past two years he has been held in Lüttich prison, without any indictment brought against him.

Of course everybody sees most readily the mistakes and deficiencies of "the others". Yet for all men of good will, inside or outside Germany, it should be a paramount responsibility to improve this situation. We simply must succeed in synchronizing these different ways of thinking. This can only happen if the Germans realize more clearly than heretofore what they have done to the world, and if the Allies for their part abandon without reservations certain policies pursued since 1945.

There was indeed a short period of insight, of consciousness of guilt and of contrition, in Germany. But then, almost immediately, there were new dictators. Opposition was directed against them because they were responsible for expelling

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

millions of Germans from the East and for all the misery connected with the occupation. During the early period of Allied solidarity, opinion in regard to the occupation as such was subconsciously formed by the German people on the basis of Russian behaviour. The suffering of that early period, the homelessness, hunger, arbitrary arrests, countless rapings, complete insecurity -- all that was so overwhelming that Germans forgot all that had gone before. People were no longer able to realize that in the last analysis only Hitler was responsible. So it happened that the Germans were cheated out of the moral fruits of the whole catastrophe.

The case of the Germans might be compared with that of a prodigal son, who after returning home will certainly turn stubborn if he is continuously and at every opportunity reminded of his earlier misdeeds. He believes it sufficient that he has himself realized the evil he has done, and forgets that the family may possibly expect both public and frequently repeated asseverations of repentance from him.

In other words, we are dealing here with some very complicated psychological associations, lying beyond the field of politics. I have myself often noticed that the same people who in private conversation show a sense of guilt for German errors, and for their own insufficiency, take a different attitude in a wider circle, especially if foreigners are present. They tend there to minimize German shortcomings, and to dramatize those of the Occupation Powers.

How deeply the German intellectuals have been wounded as a result of the Nazi period can only be appreciated by those who have spent some time in contemporary Germany. By contrast with the wage earners and business men, who live comparatively unconcerned, the intellectuals have lost self-confidence, are often spiritually apathetic and skeptical to the point of cynicism. Confidence is their fundamental need, for they are now without this asset, not less so because all too often the deficiency is hidden by noisy talk.

So far it has been demonstrated that as the Germans again take over responsibilities they become more moderate and endeavor to make the best of their situation. Many people watched the building of a coalition government by Chancellor Adenauer with fear that the inclusion of the nationalistic German Party would lead away from a moderate policy. While it is still premature to pass final judgment, one must nevertheless conclude that the Coalition has up to the present conducted itself reasonably and with great restraint. The unexpected experience has been the often nationalistic agitation of the Socialists. The probable reason for this is Dr. Schumacher's personal disappointment over the defeat of his party at the polls last summer. If this Socialist leader were in power, his policies would doubtless be very similar to those of Adenauer.

* * * * *

THE REVIVAL OF GERMAN NATIONALISM: From time to time the press of the Western World sounds warnings about German Nationalism.

The first occasion was in December, 1948, after the voting in Berlin expressed, for the first time since Hitler, a wholly unmistakable German political will. Nobody then could prophecy the outcome of these elections because Berlin, then even more than now, was in the position of an isolated, beleaguered Western fortress in the Russian zone of occupation. No political party could make any sort of promises, since there could be no assurance of fulfillment. People did not even know whether Berlin could be held by the Western Powers and the fate of all who did not give their votes to the Communist Party was extremely dubious. Yet to the surprise of all observers the Social Democrats, the most active opponents of the Communists, received the majority.

But the sincere admiration aroused by this struggle for freedom did not last long. A few days after the election a wave of excited warnings swept through the foreign press. Serious British newspapers wrote that it was doubtful whether the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Berliners had made any avowal of belief in democracy by voting Socialist. They were accused of doing so only because the Socialist Party had engaged in nationalistic propaganda. The main evidence cited for this charge was that the victorious party would not recognize the Oder-Neisse line, whereby one-quarter of pre-Hitler Germany would be ceded to the Poles and Russians. The very same British newspapers are today sarcastic because the Russians ask the German Communists to recognize the Oder-Neisse line as the final "frontier of peace".

Now criticism is flaring up again, since Germany has for the first time regained a certain amount of self-government and is consequently beginning to develop its own politics. If the Germans plead for the revision of unjustifiable verdicts, handed down by Allied tribunals, they are accused of Nationalistic conspiracies. They are Nationalists if they oppose the seizure of the Saar, without a plebiscite, by France, although the French in desiring this rich area are not called nationalistic but only anxious to insure their security. It was also called evidence of a reviving German nationalism when Ruhr workers demonstrated against the dismantling of their means of employment. And if professional employment is made available to civil servants or university professors who joined the National Socialist Party under the Third Reich, that also is regarded as a portent of reviving Nazi power.

Mr. Drew Middleton has recently been writing very extensively in the influential New York Times about the "revival of German nationalism". He is long on condemnation, but short on convincing evidence. It is charged, for instance, that Dean Erich Kaufman of Munich University is a conservative "Nationalist" and he is accused of favoring the reinstatement of ex-Nazis and reactionary professors. What is withheld from American readers is the fact that Professor Kaufman is a Jew, and therefore not very likely to act from sympathy with the Nazis, or with any illusions about them. We may be sure that if Dean Kaufman has favored the reappointment of professors who once belonged to the Nazi Party, it is because he considers them academically indispensable and politically harmless. We may also be certain that Dr. Kaufman can judge better than an American reporter whether these reappointed professors were convinced or merely nominal Nazis.

There is no doubt that some disgustingly nationalistic slogans flared up during last summer's election campaign in Western Germany. But there is equally little doubt that the Socialist Party lost out with the voters in that election precisely because it did not show restraint in its utterances. The great majority of Germans have had enough of empty slogans and patriotic trumpet calls -- and after all there are some rowdies in every country. The real ground for comment would seem to be that there is not more radicalism in the Western Zones, considering the presence there of nine million expropriated expellees.

If Dr. Schumacher, the Socialist leader, is opposed to unconditional German acceptance of the new Ruhr Authority, it is not because he is opposed to international economic control of the Ruhr and its integration with the economy of Western Europe. Dr. Schumacher actually wants more internationalization, by extending that type of control to the French and Benelux areas. He is also fearful that the Ruhr Authority as set up will prevent socialization of its heavy industry in what he regards as the interest of the German workers.

There are unquestionably some nationalistic leanings in Germany, but they do not center where Mr. Middleton and other American correspondents suspect them. The picture of German nationalism presented to the American public seems to us not to be drawn with any real insight, but to be an irrelevant potpourri of distorted information. Thus the completely unimportant followers of Strasser, or of the socialistic "Freedom Party" are widely publicized, and the German Union falsely designated as typically nationalistic. Meantime the "German Party", now making a really nationalistic hubbub outside of its place of origin in Hanover, goes almost without notice abroad.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fundamentally, however, the danger against which Americans are warned does not lie in any political groupings within Germany, but much more in the general atmosphere of opposition and the oppressive complexes of many individuals who have suffered almost beyond endurance and whose psychological difficulties cannot possibly be solved by any "re-education program" imposed from without. Nothing but the reasoning power of the Germans themselves can remove these tendencies, and the strengthening of common sense in Germany depends on the policy of the Occupation Powers.

Therefore it is very important that many of the seemingly senseless measures, such as frontier "corrections" and dismantling, are now, nearly five years after the close of fighting, coming to an end. Such measures have given the potential Nationalists a certain justification, have afforded their leaders effective arguments, and have greatly increased the difficulties of the reasonable elements in the effort to bring a new enlightenment to Germany.

* * * * *

THE BRIGHTER PROSPECT: It is really entirely natural that German "nationalism" should be producing headlines in the Anglo-American press right now. This is a result of the lag between significant happenings, and the ordinary journalistic reaction to them. The full significance of Hitler, for instance, did not dawn on most American reporters until he had been in power for some time.

It has been somewhat similar with the final phase of dismantling. Because it seemed just senseless demolition this provoked a German opposition that could easily be mistaken for nationalism -- indeed perhaps was nationalism. That feeling explains why practically every German subscriber in the Ruhr last summer cancelled his Manchester Guardian, even though that liberal English paper was lukewarm in defending dismantling. But this animosity was already declining when its effects were first noticed by the New York Times and other papers. And as the New Year dawns Germans are viewing events with much more composure.

A contributor to Die Zeit, in Hamburg, recently asked us not to print an article he had submitted, as he felt that its wording was too strong in view of the better prospects. Letters from readers in all the German press are now less aggressive than they were even a few weeks ago. Argument is beginning to center on matters of internal policy. It is therefore the more important to give the Germans an outlook on something greater than party politics. As matters stand, this can only be the idea of European unity.

A Congress of the European Movement took place in Hamburg last May. A few German students, whom the town authorities had employed as assistants for organizing the event, subsequently took such interest in the idea, that they formed an independent youth group which affiliated itself to the "Jeunesse Européenne". Since then they have persuaded the "Young Democrats" and the "Young Socialists" to join, with all their members.

It was still more surprising, that in the two upper classes of the secondary schools in Hamburg 80 per cent of all boys and girls recently gave an affirmative answer to the question of whether they were prepared to cooperate with the above mentioned "European Group" of students.

This goes to show how many positive possibilities there are in the German situation, although -- no doubt -- there are dangers too. To overcome the latter is in the main up to the Germans themselves. But we regard it as an essential contribution to our efforts for other countries to show a little more confidence in us, and to refrain from irresponsible and prejudiced reports in their press.

Dr. Marion Doenhoff, of the editorial staff of Die Zeit, in Hamburg, contributes a monthly European Supplement to HUMAN EVENTS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED